

On meromorphic mappings admitting an Algebraic Addition Theorem

Mark B. Villarino

Departamento de Matemática, Universidad de Costa Rica,
2060 San José, Costa Rica

8 June 1998

Abstract

A proper or singular abelian mapping from $\mathbb{C}^n$ to $\overline{\mathbb{C}}^n$ is parametrized by n meromorphic functions with at most $2n$ periods. We develop the existence and structure theorems of the classical theory of an abelian mapping purely on the basis of its defining functional equation, the so-called algebraic addition theorem (AAT), with no appeal to any representation as quotients of theta functions. We offer two new proofs of the periodicity of a nonrational mapping admitting an AAT. We also prove by new arguments the existence of a rational group law on an associated algebraic variety, and that all proper and singular abelian mappings do admit an AAT.

1 Introduction

Weierstrass [19] proposed the problem of determining all meromorphic mappings $\Phi: \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}^n$ of complex n -space $\mathbb{C}^n$ into complex Osgood space $\overline{\mathbb{C}}^n$ (the cartesian product of n Riemann spheres) that admit an *algebraic addition theorem* (AAT). He announced the solution to be *the set of all proper or singular abelian mappings*, i.e., those mappings

$$\Phi(\mathbf{u}) := (\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})), \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^n,$$

where $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$ are proper or singular abelian functions. Fifteen years later, Painlevé [8] proved him right for the case $n = 2$, and in 1948 and 1954 Severi [12] proved the general case.

In this paper, we obtain the fundamental properties of structure, periodicity and the group action of such a mapping, purely on the basis of its defining functional equation, the so-called AAT, without ever using their explicit representation as quotients of theta functions, which all previous proofs have used.

We achieve this by generalizing arguments originally designed for elliptic functions: our means for doing so is the Weierstrass–Hurwitz theorem that an everywhere

meromorphic function of n complex variables is rational. It does not seem to have been noticed that this is possible.

Finally, we prove that all abelian mappings do in fact admit an AAT, by means of a general principle of algebraic dependence of meromorphic functions, the so-called Weierstrass–Thimm–Siegel theorem.

In Section 2 we explicitly state the results we will prove; subsequent sections contain the proofs. Section 3 is devoted to the algebraic dependence of the component functions and their first derivatives. In the following section, we construct the addition theorem variety, of which elliptic curves, hyperelliptic surfaces and Picard varieties are particular instances. Section 5 contains two new proofs that an abelian mapping is either rational or periodic, as well as a vivid interpretation of what periodicity is. In Section 6, we give a proof the addition theorem can be expressed rationally in terms of $n + 1$ meromorphic functions on the addition theorem variety. In the next section, we use this rational addition theorem to define an abelian group law on this variety, which is the starting point of the modern theory of abelian varieties.

Finally, in Section 8, we give a direct proof that all *abelian* mappings admit an algebraic addition theorem; therefore, all the previous results are applicable to such mappings. We emphasize that we assume only that our mapping is meromorphic and admits an AAT, and then obtain as a *theorem* the classical definition, that it is parameterized by rational or periodic functions with at most $2n$ periods.

2 Statement of results

We begin with the following fundamental definition. Let $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$ be n analytically independent meromorphic functions on $\mathbb{C}^n$. They define a meromorphic mapping $\Phi: \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}^n$ where

$$\Phi : \mathbf{u} \mapsto (\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})).$$

Definition 1. We say that Φ **admits an algebraic addition theorem (AAT)** if and only if there exist n polynomials

$$G_k \equiv G_k(\lambda; x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n), \quad k = 1, \dots, n,$$

in $(2n + 1)$ variables λ and $x_1, \dots, x_n$ and $y_1, \dots, y_n$ with complex coefficients, such that the equations

$$G_k\{\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}); \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u}), \varphi_1(\mathbf{v}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{v})\} = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, n \quad (2.1)$$

hold, and none of the denominators vanish identically in $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$.

In this paper, we prove the following fundamental properties of the mapping Φ *purely on the basis of the AAT*, without making use of the results of Weierstrass, Painlevé and Severi on its explicit analytic form.

Theorem 1. (a) Any $(n + 1)$ of the $(n^2 + n)$ functions

$$\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u}), \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial u_p}(\mathbf{u}), \quad k, p = 1, \dots, n,$$

are **algebraically dependent**.

(b) Any function $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u})$ is **algebraically dependent** on its n partial derivatives of first order, $\partial \varphi_k / \partial u_p(\mathbf{u})$, $p = 1, \dots, n$.

(c) Any one of the n^2 **first-order partial derivatives** $\partial \varphi_k / \partial u_p(\mathbf{u})$ ($k, p = 1, \dots, n$) is algebraically dependent on the n original functions $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$.

Theorem 2. The n^2 partial derivatives $\partial \varphi_k / \partial u_p(\mathbf{u})$, for $k, p = 1, \dots, n$, generate a **simple algebraic extension** $\mathcal{F}$ of the field of rational functions of $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$ with complex coefficients. The minimal polynomial $V(\theta; x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of this extension is satisfied by

$$x_1 := \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, x_n := \varphi_n(\mathbf{u}), \quad \theta := \sum_{k,p=1}^n \alpha_{kp} \frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial u_p}(\mathbf{u}),$$

where, for suitable $\alpha_{kp} \in \mathbb{C}$, the function θ is a **primitive element** of $\mathcal{F}$. Thus

$$V\{\theta(\mathbf{u}); \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})\} = 0.$$

Definition 2. The hypersurface in $\overline{\mathbb{C}}^{n+1}$ defined by

$$V(\theta; x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0 \tag{2.2}$$

is called the **addition theorem variety** $\mathcal{A}$.

Theorem 3. Any generator $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ of $\mathcal{F}$ that is not rational is **periodic**.

Theorem 4 (Rational form of the AAT). Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ be two independent variables and let $\theta, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ generate the addition theorem variety $\mathcal{A}$. Then there exist $(n + 1)$ **rational** functions

$$R_k(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n; y_0, y_1, \dots, y_n), \quad k = 0, \dots, n$$

of $(2n + 2)$ variables $x_0, \dots, x_n, y_0, \dots, y_n$ with constant coefficients, such that the equations

$$\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}) = R_k\{\theta(\mathbf{u}), \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u}); \theta(\mathbf{v}), \varphi_1(\mathbf{v}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{v})\}$$

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$ hold, and none of the denominators vanish identically in $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$.

Theorem 5. The rational addition theorem (Theorem 4) defines an **abelian group law** on the addition theorem variety $\mathcal{A}$.

Theorem 6. Every proper or singular abelian mapping admits an algebraic addition theorem.

3 Algebraic dependence of first order derivatives

Theorem 1a is the general result, while parts 1b and 1c are immediate corollaries. We prove this theorem by means of an explicit elimination process which amounts to a finite algorithm that uses only rational operations. Painlevé [8] obtains related results by a completely different procedure that involves the reversion of infinite series, something which our algorithm avoids completely, and he does not obtain the general principle stated in Theorem 1a.

Theorems 1b and 1c are well-known properties of the abelian functions, but our proof shows that *any* meromorphic mapping that has an AAT enjoys these two properties, and that the AAT is the primordial reason for that. Thus, all *rational* mappings have these properties, since they admit an AAT.

Proof of Theorem 1. The AAT (2.1) for the mapping Φ can be rewritten as

$$G_k[\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}); \Phi(\mathbf{u}), \Phi(\mathbf{v})] = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, n, \quad (3.1)$$

where $G_1(\lambda_1; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \not\equiv 0, \dots, G_n(\lambda_n; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \not\equiv 0$ are polynomials in the $2n + 1$ variables $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and λ_k . Differentiating

$$G_1[\varphi_1(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}); \Phi(\mathbf{u}), \Phi(\mathbf{v})] = 0 \quad (3.2)$$

with respect to u_1 and then v_1 , we get

$$\frac{\partial G_1}{\partial \lambda_1} \frac{\partial \lambda_1}{\partial u_1} + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial G_1}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial x_k}{\partial u_1} = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

$$\frac{\partial G_1}{\partial \lambda_1} \frac{\partial \lambda_1}{\partial v_1} + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial G_1}{\partial y_k} \frac{\partial y_k}{\partial v_1} = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Now

$$\frac{\partial \lambda_1}{\partial u_1} = \frac{\partial \varphi_1(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})}{\partial u_1} = \frac{\partial \varphi_1(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})}{\partial (u_1 + v_1)} = \frac{\partial \varphi_1(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})}{\partial v_1} = \frac{\partial \lambda_1}{\partial v_1}. \quad (3.5)$$

Therefore, subtracting (3.4) from (3.3) and using (3.5), we arrive at

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial G_1}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial x_k}{\partial u_1} - \frac{\partial G_1}{\partial y_k} \frac{\partial y_k}{\partial v_1} \right) = 0, \quad (3.6)$$

whose left hand side is a polynomial in the variables $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n, \partial x_1 / \partial u_1, \dots, \partial x_n / \partial u_1, \partial y_1 / \partial v_1, \dots, \partial y_n / \partial v_1$ and λ_1 . If we take the greatest common divisor of (3.6) and the AAT (3.2), we obtain an equation of the form

$$g_{11} \left(\lambda_1; x_1, \dots, x_n, \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial u_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial x_n}{\partial u_1}, y_1, \dots, y_n, \frac{\partial y_1}{\partial v_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial v_1} \right) = 0,$$

and the remainder, set equal to zero, is the *eliminant*:

$$H_{11} \left(x_1, \dots, x_n, \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial u_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial x_n}{\partial u_1}, y_1, \dots, y_n, \frac{\partial y_1}{\partial v_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial v_1} \right) = 0.$$

If we now differentiate (3.6) with respect to u_p and then v_p for $p = 2, \dots, n$, we get the greatest common divisors

$$g_{1p}\left(\lambda_1; x_1, \dots, x_n, \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial u_p}, \dots, \frac{\partial x_n}{\partial u_p}, y_1, \dots, y_n, \frac{\partial y_1}{\partial v_p}, \dots, \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial v_p}\right) = 0,$$

and the eliminants

$$H_{1p}\left(x_1, \dots, x_n, \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial u_p}, \dots, \frac{\partial x_n}{\partial u_p}, y_1, \dots, y_n, \frac{\partial y_1}{\partial v_p}, \dots, \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial v_p}\right) = 0.$$

We now apply the same process to the AATs $G_2 = 0, G_3 = 0, \dots, G_n = 0$. Then we get a total of n^2 greatest common divisors

$$g_{kp}\left(\lambda_k; x_1, \dots, x_n, \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial u_p}, \dots, \frac{\partial x_n}{\partial u_p}, y_1, \dots, y_n, \frac{\partial y_1}{\partial v_p}, \dots, \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial v_p}\right) = 0$$

and n^2 eliminant equations:

$$H_{kp}\left(x_1, \dots, x_n, \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial u_p}, \dots, \frac{\partial x_n}{\partial u_p}, y_1, \dots, y_n, \frac{\partial y_1}{\partial v_p}, \dots, \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial v_p}\right) = 0,$$

for $k, p = 1, \dots, n$. We observe that each polynomial g_{kp} and H_{kp} is symmetric in $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n), (\partial x_1/\partial u_p, \partial y_1/\partial v_p), \dots, (\partial x_n/\partial u_p, \partial y_n/\partial v_p)$ as a consequence of the AAT (3.1) and the symmetry of $(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})$ in $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$.

If we suitably fix the variable $\mathbf{v}$, the n^2 eliminant equations become

$$h_{kp}\left(x_1, \dots, x_n, \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial u_p}, \dots, \frac{\partial x_n}{\partial u_p}\right) = 0, \quad k, p = 1, \dots, n, \quad (3.7)$$

where h_{kp} is a polynomial in the $2n$ variables $x_1, \dots, x_n, \partial x_1/\partial u_p, \dots, \partial x_n/\partial u_p$. Therefore the n^2 equations (3.7) relate the $n + n^2$ variables $x_1, \dots, x_n, \partial x_k/\partial u_p$ ($k, p = 1, \dots, n$), and we can eliminate any $(n^2 - 1)$ of them, leaving the remaining $(n + 1)$ of them as algebraically dependent. This proves Theorem 1. $\square$

4 The addition theorem variety

Theorem 2 reveals the origin of elliptic curves, elliptic hypersurfaces, $\dots$, abelian varieties. They are all manifestations of the *addition theorem variety* $\mathcal{A}$, generated by the n^2 partial derivatives $\partial \varphi_k/\partial u_p(\mathbf{u})$ ($k, p = 1, \dots, n$) over the field of rational functions of $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$. Painlevé [8] also arrives at $\mathcal{A}$, although in not quite so explicit a form, and from a slightly different point of view. He transforms the n^2 equations for the first order partial derivatives into a system of total (algebraic) differential equations

$$\begin{aligned} du_1 &= p_{11}(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_1 + \dots + p_{1n}(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_n, \\ &\vdots \\ du_n &= p_{n1}(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_1 + \dots + p_{nn}(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_n, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where $x_1 = \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, x_n = \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$, and

$$p_{ij} := \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} = \frac{1}{J} \frac{\partial J}{\partial z_{ij}}, \quad (i, j = 1, \dots, n),$$

where $z_{ij} := \partial \varphi_i / \partial u_j(\mathbf{u})$ and J is the determinant of the Jacobian matrix $[z_{ij}]$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. (We have altered Painlevé's notation to conform with ours, and have considered the case of general n , instead of $n = 2$ as he does.) Now he states:

“... as is well known, one may rationally express [the algebraic irrationalities] $p_{ij}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ in terms of $x_1, \dots, x_n$ and a unique irrationality $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ defined by means of an algebraic relation

$$S(\theta; x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0,$$

which is such that conversely, θ is rationally expressible in $x_1, \dots, x_n, p_{ij}$ ($i, j = 1, \dots, n$). Since p or $\partial u_1 / \partial x_1$ is rationally deducible from $\partial u_i / \partial x_j$ ($i, j = 1, \dots, n$), as also are [all the other] p_{ij} , the function $\theta(\mathbf{u})$ is uniform and meromorphic at the same time as $x_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, x_n(\mathbf{u})$ [8, §7].”

He never explicitly constructs θ as $\sum_{k,p=1}^n \alpha_{kp} z_{kp}$ with $\alpha_{kp} \in \mathbb{C}$, which is crucial for our further development of the theory. His entire approach is based on the system (4.1) on the addition theorem variety $\mathcal{A}$, which he calls “the algebraic surface parametrized by the functions $x_1, \dots, x_n$ ”.

Proof of Theorem 2. This is an immediate consequence of elementary field theory, the primitive element theorem [6, p. 243] and Theorem 1c, the corollary that every first-order partial derivative $\partial \varphi_k / \partial u_p(\mathbf{u})$ is algebraically dependent on $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$. $\square$

5 Periodicity

We present *two proofs* that the mapping Φ is periodic. Our proofs are based on the Weierstrass–Hurwitz theorem that a meromorphic function in $\overline{\mathbb{C}}^n$ with no essential singularities is a *rational* function of all its variables, and vice versa; and on a weak form of Picard’s theorem on the behaviour of an analytic function of one variable in the vicinity of an isolated essential singularity. Both proofs show that the “cause” or “explanation” of the existence of a period $\mathbf{p} \neq 0$ of the meromorphic mapping Φ is *the simultaneous occurrence of two antithetical properties* of Φ :

- the wild chaotic dispersion of values of Φ in the neighbourhood of the essential singularity at infinity (an “irresistible force”);
- the rigid unyielding restriction on the values of $\Phi(\mathbf{u})$ imposed by the polynomial form of the AAT (an “immovable object”).

The mathematical resolution of this ancient philosophical conundrum is this: *the solution set $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ of the equation $\Phi(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}^n$ fixed, is a discrete k -dimensional real lattice, $0 \leq k \leq 2n$.* This beautiful interpretation of periodicity is due, in principle, to Weierstrass for the case of functions of one variable.

Painlevé [8] also proves that Φ is periodic. But his proof is totally different. He starts from the system (4.1) of total (algebraic) differential equations and shows that $u_1, \dots, u_n$ are line integrals on $\mathcal{A}$ of the first, second or third kinds. Then the topology of $\mathcal{A}$ shows that its fundamental group is generated by $k \leq 2n$ linearly independent cycles. Our proofs, on the other hand, avoid the topology of $\mathcal{A}$ and the theory of line integrals on $\mathcal{A}$, and work directly with the polynomials of the AAT and the singularities of Φ at infinity.

Definition 3. Let Φ be the meromorphic mapping

$$\Phi: \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}^n : \mathbf{u} \mapsto (\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u}))$$

defined by the n meromorphic functions $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$. We say that Φ is **periodic** if and only if there exists a nonzero $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that

$$\Phi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{p}) = \Phi(\mathbf{u})$$

for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ where Φ is defined. The vector $\mathbf{p}$ is called a **period** of Φ .

We shall present two proofs of Theorem 3 that are based on the existence of an essential singularity plane at infinity of at least one of the component functions $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$. The first proof is direct, while the second uses an important sufficient condition for periodicity.

5.1 Picard’s “tiny” theorem

Picard’s “great” theorem affirms that if a meromorphic function $\varphi(u)$ of one complex variable u has an essential singularity at infinity, then for any choice of complex number c (with at most two exceptions), the solution set of the equation $\varphi(u) = c$ is an infinite discrete set on the complex u -plane. In his lectures, Weierstrass proved the following “tiny” version at least twenty years before Picard:

Theorem 7. *Suppose that the function $\varphi(u)$ has an isolated singularity at the point $u = a$. Let c be an arbitrary complex constant and let $|w - c| < h$ be an arbitrarily small neighbourhood of the point c . Then there exists a point c' in this neighbourhood such that the equation $\varphi(u) = c'$ has infinitely many roots which accumulate onto the point a .*

The elegant elementary proof can be found in Hancock [4], Osgood [7] and Phragmén [10].

5.2 The solution set $\Phi(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{a}$

The analytic hypersurface $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ defined by the vector equation

$$\Phi(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{a}, \quad \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n \text{ fixed,}$$

is a complicated set of points. However, we are interested in a very elementary property of $S_{\mathbf{a}}$.

Theorem 8. *Suppose that $\Phi(\mathbf{u})$ is not a rational mapping, i.e., that at least one of the coordinate functions $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u})$ ($k = 1, \dots, n$) is transcendental. Suppose further that Φ is holomorphic at the point $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{a}$ and that $\Phi(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{a}$. Then the set $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ contains infinitely many distinct points $\mathbf{u}_n$ that accumulate on at least one plane at infinity.*

Proof. We assume that the Jacobian determinant is nonzero in a neighbourhood of $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{a} := (a_1, \dots, a_n)$. Then the set of equations becomes

$$\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}) = a_1, \varphi_2(\mathbf{u}) = a_2, \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u}) = a_n.$$

Suppose that $\varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$ is transcendental; then it is not a rational function of $u_1, \dots, u_n$. Now the Weierstrass–Hurwitz theorem [5] states that $\varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$ is rational in $\mathbf{u}$ if and only if it has no essential singularities in $\overline{\mathbb{C}^n}$. But $\varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$, being transcendental, does have essential singularities; however, it is meromorphic in all of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Therefore it has at least one plane at infinity as an essential singularity surface. Suppose that plane is $u_n = \infty$.

We now revert the equations

$$\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}) = a_1, \dots, \varphi_{n-1}(\mathbf{u}) = a_{n-1}$$

to get

$$u_1 = F_1(u_n), u_2 = F_2(u_n), \dots, u_{n-1} = F_{n-1}(u_n) \quad (5.1)$$

and substitute these expansions into $\varphi_n(\mathbf{u}) = a_n$, to get an equation of the form

$$\varphi_n\{F_1(u_n), \dots, F_{n-1}(u_n), u_n\} = a_n,$$

or $F_n(u_n) = a_n$ (say), which is a meromorphic function in finite $\mathbb{C}$ with an essential singularity at infinity. Therefore, by Picard’s theorem, there is an infinity of values

$$u_n = a_0, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k, \dots$$

which are distinct roots of $F_n(u_n) = a_n$ and accumulate on $u_n = \infty$. Any one of these, say $u_n = v'$, when substituted into (5.1) will give values $u_j = v_j$ ($j = 1, \dots, n-1$) such that

$$\varphi_1(v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, v') = a_1, \varphi_{n-1}(v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, v') = a_{n-1}, \dots, \varphi_n(v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, v') = a_n.$$

Thus, as $u_n = v'$ runs through the infinitely many roots of $F_n(u_n) = a_n$, the points $(v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, v')$ run through infinitely many values that satisfy $\Phi(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{a}$ and accumulate on $u_n = \infty$. $\square$

5.3 First proof of periodicity

Proof of Theorem 3. The AAT for a particular $\varphi := \varphi_k$ has the form

$$G[\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}); \Phi(\mathbf{u}), \Phi(\mathbf{v})] = 0. \quad (5.2)$$

Let $\mathbf{c}_2 := \Phi(\mathbf{v})$ for some $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Then, by Theorem 8,

$$V := \{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^n : \Phi(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{c}_2 \}$$

contains infinitely many distinct elements $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots$ that accumulate on at least one of the planes at infinity. Let m be the degree of G in the first variable $\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})$ and choose $m + 1$ values of $\mathbf{v}_k$. We assume that we choose $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that

$$\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}_{m+1}$$

are nonsingular points of Φ ; this we can do since there are only a finite number of the $\mathbf{v}_k$. Then, if

$$\mathbf{c}_1 := \Phi(\mathbf{u}), \quad (5.3)$$

the equation (5.2) becomes

$$G[\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}_k); \mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2] = 0,$$

which is an algebraic equation of degree m whose roots are the $m + 1$ numbers

$$\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}_1), \varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}_2), \dots, \varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}_{m+1}),$$

and so at least two are equal:

$$\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}_k) = \varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}_l). \quad (5.4)$$

This holds for any $\mathbf{u}$ in a neighbourhood of the original one. Moreover, since φ is holomorphic in a neighbourhood of $\mathbf{u}$ and Φ is holomorphic in the translated points $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}_k$, then Φ is holomorphic in a neighbourhood of each $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}_k$ and we can take each such neighbourhood to be the translate of a sufficiently small neighbourhood of $\mathbf{u}$. For each $\mathbf{u}$, we get a different $\mathbf{c}_1$ in (5.3), and so a possibly different pair $\mathbf{v}_k$ and $\mathbf{v}_l$ in (5.4). But there are only $(m + 1)^2$ pairs $(\mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{v}_l)$ available, so there is an entire neighbourhood of values of $\mathbf{u}$ in which (5.4) holds for the *same* pair $(\mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{v}_l)$. This means that

$$\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}_k) \equiv \varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}_l)$$

identically; or equivalently, $\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}_k - \mathbf{v}_l) \equiv \varphi(\mathbf{u})$, and so $\mathbf{v}_k - \mathbf{v}_l$ is a period of φ . $\square$

5.4 Second proof of periodicity

5.4.1 The algebraic differential equations

The periodicity of at least one of the functions $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$ depends on the existence of algebraic differential equations of the first order. In Theorem 1c we proved that each one of the n^2 first-order partial derivatives $\partial\varphi_k/\partial u_p(\mathbf{u})$ ($k, p = 1, \dots, n$) is algebraically dependent on these n original functions; that is, there exist n^2 polynomials $P_{kp}(z_0; z_1, \dots, z_n)$ in the $(n+1)$ variables $z_0, z_1, \dots, z_n$ with complex coefficients such that the following relations hold identically:

$$P_{kp}\left(\frac{\partial\varphi_k}{\partial u_p}(\mathbf{u}); \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})\right) \equiv 0. \quad (5.5)$$

Theorem 9. *Suppose that the analytically independent functions $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ admit an AAT. Then the partial derivatives of orders two and beyond are uniquely determined as rational functions of the n^2 first-order partial derivatives $\partial\varphi_k/\partial u_p$ ($k, p = 1, \dots, n$).*

Proof. By Theorem 1c, there exist n^2 polynomials $P_{kp}(z_0; z_1, \dots, z_n)$ satisfying (5.5). Let us abbreviate $P_{kp,i} = \partial P_{kp}/\partial z_i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Differentiating the equations $P_{kp} = 0$ with respect to u_q , we obtain

$$\frac{\partial^2 \varphi_k}{\partial u_p \partial u_q} = -\frac{1}{P_{kp,0}} \left(P_{kp,1} \frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial u_q} + \dots + P_{kp,n} \frac{\partial \varphi_n}{\partial u_q} \right). \quad (5.6)$$

It is obvious how to continue to derivatives of higher order. Therefore, all partial derivatives of the P_{kp} , i.e., all the $P_{kp,i}$, all the $P_{kp,ij} = \partial^2 P_{kp}/\partial z_i \partial z_j$, and so on, are polynomials in $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ and $\partial\varphi_i/\partial u_q$ ($i, q = 1, \dots, n$) whose coefficients are complex constants. $\square$

5.4.2 A sufficient condition for periodicity

The following theorem generalizes to n complex variables a sufficient condition for periodicity first stated and proved (in lectures) by Weierstrass. As we shall see, it is an essential element in the theory of functions that admit an AAT.

Recall that the *derivative* $\Phi'(\mathbf{u})$ of the mapping Φ is the $n \times n$ Jacobian matrix whose (k, p) -entry is the partial derivative $\partial\varphi_k/\partial u_p(\mathbf{u})$.

Theorem 10. *Suppose that the meromorphic mapping Φ admits an AAT. If there exist two distinct points $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that*

$$\Phi(\mathbf{a}) = \Phi(\mathbf{b}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi'(\mathbf{a}) = \Phi'(\mathbf{b}), \quad (5.7)$$

and if each $P_{kp,0} \neq 0$, then the mapping Φ is periodic with period $\mathbf{p} := \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}$.

Proof. By assumption, $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$ are holomorphic in a neighbourhood of both $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$. By Taylor's theorem,

$$\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{a}) = \varphi_k(\mathbf{a}) + \sum_{p=1}^n \frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial u_p}(\mathbf{a}) u_p + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p,q=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \varphi_k}{\partial u_p \partial u_q}(\mathbf{a}) u_p u_q + \dots \quad (5.8)$$

$$\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b}) = \varphi_k(\mathbf{b}) + \sum_{p=1}^n \frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial u_p}(\mathbf{b}) u_p + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p,q=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \varphi_k}{\partial u_p \partial u_q}(\mathbf{b}) u_p u_q + \dots \quad (5.9)$$

Using the notation

$$\alpha_k := \varphi_k(\mathbf{a}) = \varphi_k(\mathbf{b}), \quad \alpha_{k,p} := \frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial u_p}(\mathbf{a}) = \frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial u_p}(\mathbf{b}),$$

and obvious extensions to higher derivatives, the equations (5.9) become

$$\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{a}) = \alpha_k + \sum_{p=1}^n \alpha_{k,p} u_p + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p,q=1}^n \alpha_{k,pq} u_p u_q + \dots \quad (5.10)$$

$$\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b}) = \alpha_k + \sum_{p=1}^n \alpha_{k,p} u_p + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p,q=1}^n \beta_{k,pq} u_p u_q + \dots \quad (5.11)$$

But by Theorem 9 and the assumption (5.7), all the higher partial derivatives of $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ are uniquely determined by the values of the α_k and the $\alpha_{k,p}$; which means [and here we use $P_{kp,0} \neq 0$, when plugging in (5.6)]:

$$\alpha_{k,pq} = \beta_{k,pq}, \quad \alpha_{k,pqr} = \beta_{k,pqr}, \quad \dots \quad \text{for all } k, p, q, r, \dots$$

and therefore the two expansions (5.11) are identical. This means that the equation

$$\Phi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{a}) \equiv \Phi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$$

holds identically in $\mathbf{u}$, which implies that $\Phi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}) \equiv \Phi(\mathbf{u})$, and that therefore $\mathbf{p} := \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}$ is a period vector. $\square$

5.4.3 Completion of the proof

Second proof of Theorem 3. We assume that $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$ are n analytically independent meromorphic functions that admit an AAT. Moreover, we assume that $\varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$ is *not* a rational function of $\mathbf{u}$. We know the set $S_{\mathbf{a}} = \{ \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^n : \Phi(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{a} \}$ contains an infinite number of points $\mathbf{v}_k$ such that $v_{kn} \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

We now apply a Dirichlet pigeon-hole principle argument to the n^2 -tuples of values $\partial \varphi_k / \partial u_p(\mathbf{u})$ ($k, p = 1, \dots, n$) as $\mathbf{u}$ runs over the points $\mathbf{v}_k \in S_{\mathbf{a}}$. Each such function value is a root of the algebraic equations

$$P_{kp} \left(\frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial u_p}(\mathbf{u}); a_1, \dots, a_n \right) = 0, \quad (k, p = 1, \dots, n),$$

of respective degrees m_{kp} in the first variables $\partial\varphi_k/\partial u_p$. Therefore, the maximum number of distinct n^2 -tuples is the product $\prod_{k,p=1}^n m_{kp} < \infty$. Therefore, as $\mathbf{u}$ runs over the infinite set of pairs $\{\mathbf{v}_k\}$, there is an infinite subsequence $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r, \dots$ in $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ such that

$$\frac{\partial\varphi_k}{\partial u_p}(\mathbf{b}_1) = \frac{\partial\varphi_k}{\partial u_p}(\mathbf{b}_2) = \dots \quad \text{for each } k, p = 1, \dots, n.$$

These equations more than fulfil the sufficient conditions of Theorem 10 for φ_n to be periodic with the period vector $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{b}_1 - \mathbf{b}_2$. Thus we have proved that φ_n is a periodic function. $\square$

6 The rational addition theorem

The only published proof of the rational form of the AAT (Theorem 4), is due to Siegel [16, pp. 94–96], and is only for the case in which $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$ are n independent abelian functions. We shall adapt it to the case of *any* mapping Φ with an AAT. Let φ be any one of the φ_k . Then Siegel's proof consists of the following steps:

- (i) Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the field of abelian functions generated by $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is a *simple algebraic extension* of $\mathbb{C}(\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u}))$ with primitive element $\varphi_0(\mathbf{u})$.
- (ii) For each fixed $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{b}$, the function $\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$ is an element of $\mathcal{F}$, and is therefore a *rational* function of $\varphi_0(\mathbf{u}), \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$.
- (iii) For each fixed $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{b}$, the function $\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}$, and for each fixed $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{a}$, the function $\varphi(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{v})$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}$. Therefore $\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})$ lies in $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}$, i.e., it is rational *jointly* in $\varphi_0(\mathbf{u}), \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$ and $\varphi_0(\mathbf{v}), \varphi_1(\mathbf{v}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{v})$.

There is a large literature on the question of proving that functions that are rational in each variable separately are also rational in those variables jointly; see, e.g., [1, 5, 7, 9] among others. Siegel uses the argument expounded in the book of Bochner and Martin [2, pp. 199–203] (wherein further sources are cited), although he does not say so explicitly.

Siegel proves (i) by a detailed analysis of the period matrix and the “Thetasatz” of Weierstrass and Riemann [16], which affirms that every abelian function belonging to a given period matrix can be represented as a quotient of two (generalized) theta functions, to prove that $\varphi_0(\mathbf{u}), \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$ satisfy a polynomial equation

$$P[\varphi_0(\mathbf{u}), \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})] = 0,$$

where $P(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n) \neq 0$ is a polynomial with constant coefficients such that

- I. its degree q in x_0 does not depend on φ_0 , but is *uniquely determined* by $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$;
- II. its degree r in $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ does not depend on $\mathbf{u}$.

Therefore any φ_0 whose degree in P is maximal will be a primitive element for $\mathcal{F}$.

In our case, we define $\mathcal{F}$ *directly* as

$$\mathcal{F} := \mathbb{C}(x_1, \dots, x_n)(\theta),$$

and try to adapt Siegel's reasoning to our situation. Thus, step (i) for us is trivial, since it's true by definition.

Step (ii) is trivial for Siegel, since if $\varphi(\mathbf{u})$ is an abelian function so is $\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$, because it belongs to the same period matrix and is also meromorphic. However, step (ii) is not trivial for us. We prove it in two stages:

- (a) For each fixed $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{b}$, the function $\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$ lies in a *finite algebraic extension* of $\mathbb{C}(\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u}))$ whose degree does not depend on $\mathbf{b}$.
- (b) The degree of this extension is *one*, and therefore $\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$ lies in $\mathcal{F}$.

The assertion (a) is an immediate consequence of the AAT, while for (b) it suffices to prove:

- (b') The function $\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$ is *uniquely determined* by $(\theta(\mathbf{u}), \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u}))$; that is, given any $(n+1)$ -tuple $(\theta; x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{A}$, any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that

$$\theta(\mathbf{u}) = \theta; \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}) = x_1, \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u}) = x_n$$

will give *the same numerical value* of $\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$.

Our proof of (b') uses our explicit construction of the primitive element θ , the separability of the minimal polynomial $V(\theta; x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of the extension $\mathcal{F} : \mathbb{C}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, of which θ and all its conjugates are the roots, and the sufficient condition, Theorem 10, for the periodicity of Φ .

Step (iii) is not trivial for Siegel nor for us. But the fundamental lemma which he proves, on the basis of properties (I) and (II) of his polynomial $P(x_0, \dots, x_n)$, are trivial for us and our polynomial $V(\theta; x_1, \dots, x_n)$. To make the argument work, Siegel proves the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *For each $k = 0, 1, \dots, h$, there exists an algebraic relation between*

$$\theta_k := \varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}) \theta^{h-k}$$

and $x_1, \dots, x_n$, whose total degree does not exceed a bound r independent of $\mathbf{v}$.

Proof. (We have altered Siegel's notation of to conform with ours.) Siegel proves this lemma by appealing to the "Thetasatz" of Weierstrass and Riemann [16], which affirms that every abelian function belonging to a given period matrix can be represented as a quotient of two (generalized) theta functions.

But this claim is trivial from our point of view, since the degree of the AAT for $\varphi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})$ does not depend on $\mathbf{v}$, nor does the degree of the field polynomial $V(\theta; x_1, \dots, x_n)$ defining the algebraic extension $\mathcal{F}$. The degree of V in *any* of its $(n+1)$ variables does not depend on $\mathbf{v}$. But the polynomial over $\mathbb{C}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ whose roots are the θ_k is obtainable from the coefficients of the polynomial giving the AAT for $\varphi(\mathbf{u})$ and the polynomial $V(\theta; x_1, \dots, x_n)$ by means of a finite number of rational operations, as given in the theory of elimination. Therefore, the total degree will be bounded by an integer r which does not depend on $\mathbf{v}$. $\square$

Once we get past that step, Siegel's proof carries over word for word, and we are done.

Proof of Theorem 4. The proof consists in verifying the following four lemmas. $\square$

Lemma 2. *For each fixed $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{b}$, the function $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$ is an element of a finite algebraic extension of $\mathcal{F}$, for $k = 1, \dots, n$.*

Proof. The AAT for $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})$ is of the form (2.1), where $G_k(\lambda; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is a polynomial with constant coefficients, not all zero, in the $(2n+1)$ variables $\lambda, x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n$. Taking $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{b}$ gives

$$G_k[\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b}); \Phi(\mathbf{u}), \Phi(\mathbf{b})] = 0,$$

and this is a polynomial whose coefficients are rational functions of $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$ and whose roots are the values of $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$. That is, they lie in a finite extension field of $\mathbb{C}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and thus of $\mathbb{C}(\theta; x_1, \dots, x_n)$ also. $\square$

Lemma 3. *Each value of the primitive element θ of $\mathcal{F}$ uniquely determines the n^2 values of the first-order partial derivatives $\partial\varphi_k/\partial u_p(\mathbf{u})$, for $k, p = 1, \dots, n$.*

Proof. By definition,

$$\theta = \sum_{k,p=1}^n \alpha_{kp} \frac{\partial\varphi_k}{\partial u_p}(\mathbf{u}),$$

for suitable $\alpha_{kp} \in \mathbb{C}$. As each of the partial derivatives $\partial\varphi_k/\partial u_p(\mathbf{u})$ independently runs over all its respective conjugate values, the function θ takes on all of its h distinct values as the distinct roots of the minimal polynomial

$$V(\theta; x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0. \tag{6.1}$$

Thus, each choice of n^2 values of $\partial\varphi_k/\partial u_p(\mathbf{u})$ gives a unique θ and each θ gives a unique set of n^2 partial derivatives. $\square$

Lemma 4. *Each $(n + 1)$ -tuple $(\theta; x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{A}$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is the addition theorem variety, uniquely determines the value of $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$.*

Proof. Fix a particular point $(\theta; x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{A}$. The the n numbers $x_1, \dots, x_n$ determine a solution set U of the equations

$$\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}) = x_1, \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u}) = x_n, \quad (6.2)$$

that is, $U = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{C}^n : \Phi(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{x}\}$. Let $|U|$ denote the cardinality of U , and write $\Theta := \{\theta(\mathbf{u}) : \mathbf{u} \in U\}$.

We consider three possibilities. Firstly, if $|U|$ is less than the degree h in θ of the polynomial V in (6.1), then $|\Theta| < h$, so there are fewer than h values θ , which is impossible.

Secondly, if $|U| = h$, then one value of θ corresponds to one value of $\mathbf{u}$ and vice versa, so that $\mathbf{u}$ is uniquely determined, and therefore $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$ is uniquely determined, since φ_k is single-valued.

Lastly, if $|U| > h$, then $|\Theta| > h$, so that more than h values of θ satisfy the field equation (6.1), of degree h in the θ variable. Therefore, $\theta(\mathbf{u})$ takes on the same value at two distinct members $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2 \in U$. Now $\Phi'(\mathbf{a}_1) = \Phi'(\mathbf{a}_2)$ on account of Lemma 3, and $\Phi(\mathbf{a}_1) = \Phi(\mathbf{a}_2)$ also by assumption (6.2). By Theorem 10, $\Phi(\mathbf{u})$ is periodic with period $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}_2$. Hence $\varphi_k(\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{b}) = \varphi_k(\mathbf{a}_2 + \mathbf{b})$ for any $\mathbf{b}$. The conclusion is that $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{b}) = \varphi_k(\mathbf{u}_2 + \mathbf{b})$ whenever $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \in U$ satisfy $\theta(\mathbf{u}_1) = \theta(\mathbf{u}_2)$, so that in this case also, $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$ is uniquely determined. $\square$

Lemma 5. *For each fixed $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{b}$, the function $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$ is an element of the field $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2, $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$ lies in an extension field of $\mathcal{F}$, and by Lemma 4, $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$ is a *single-valued* algebraic function of $(\theta; x_1, \dots, x_n)$, which means that the degree of the polynomial defining $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$ in an extension field of $\mathcal{F}$ is of *degree one*, that is to say, $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b})$ lies in $\mathcal{F}$ itself. $\square$

7 The group law

Our point of view leads to a very explicit form of the group law on the addition theorem variety $\mathcal{A}$ in terms of the functions and their first derivatives. This explicit form has not been cited in the literature, much less proved, for the case of $n > 1$ variables. Of course, it is a well-known theorem of Liouville in the case $n = 1$ of elliptic functions. Our development shows that our form of the group law is the “natural” one that springs organically from the explicit polynomials of the AAT.

The converse is also true. That is, we have proved that if Φ admits an AAT, then it determines an algebraic variety with an abelian group law. Picard [11] proved that if an algebraic variety has a transitive group law defined on it, then the variety can be parametrized by abelian functions, and it is well known that they have an AAT. Moreover, if the group is not transitive, then the variety can be parametrized by singular abelian functions, and they in turn can be proved to admit an AAT (see

Section 8). This last result is the crowning achievement of half a century of effort, starting with the memoir of Painlevé [8] and culminating in the work of Severi [12].

Lemma 6. *If $\varphi(\mathbf{u})$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}$, so also does $\varphi(-\mathbf{u})$.*

Proof. Apply the AAT (2.1) of $\Phi(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})$ to $\Phi(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u})$:

$$G_k[\varphi_k(\mathbf{0}); \Phi(\mathbf{u}), \Phi(-\mathbf{u})] = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, n,$$

which can be reexpressed as

$$D_k[\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u}); \varphi_1(-\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(-\mathbf{u})] = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, n, \quad (7.1)$$

for some polynomial $D_k(x_1, \dots, x_n; y_1, \dots, y_n) \not\equiv 0$. (Note that if D_k were to vanish identically, we could use instead $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{b}$, $\mathbf{v} = -\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{b}$ for a suitable value of $\mathbf{b}$.) If we eliminate, say, $\varphi_2(-\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(-\mathbf{u})$ from (7.1), we obtain

$$E_1[\varphi_1(-\mathbf{u}); \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})] = 0,$$

which means that $\varphi_1(-\mathbf{u})$ is algebraically dependent on $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})$. The same holds for $\varphi_2(-\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(-\mathbf{u})$. Thus $\Phi(-\mathbf{u})$ admits an AAT wherein the coefficients of the powers of $\varphi_k(-\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})$ are rational functions of $\Phi(\mathbf{u})$ and $\Phi(\mathbf{v})$. The reasoning we used for the rational addition theorem now shows that $\varphi(-\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})$ lies in $\mathcal{F}$ for each fixed $\mathbf{v}$. In particular, $\varphi(-\mathbf{u})$ lies in $\mathcal{F}$. $\square$

Corollary 1 (Subtraction theorem). *$\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})$ lies in $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}$.* $\square$

Proof of Theorem 5. We define the operation of **addition** on the addition theorem variety $\mathcal{A}$ as follows. If

$$P_1 := (\theta(\mathbf{u}); \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u})) \quad \text{and} \quad P_2 := (\theta(\mathbf{v}); \varphi_1(\mathbf{v}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{v})),$$

then

$$P_1 \oplus P_2 := (\theta(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}); \varphi_1(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})),$$

and we define *subtraction* by

$$P_1 \ominus P_2 := (\theta(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}); \varphi_1(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})).$$

This evidently defines an abelian group on $\mathcal{A}$ with identity $(\theta(\mathbf{0}); \varphi_1(\mathbf{0}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{0}))$. In fact, for each fixed $\mathbf{v}$, the rational addition theorem, Theorem 4, yields a birational regular mapping of $\mathcal{A}$ onto itself, and therefore we obtain a *group* of birational regular mappings of the addition theorem variety onto itself. $\square$

8 Proper and singular abelian functions

We can reformulate Theorem 3 as follows:

*A meromorphic mapping Φ that admits an algebraic addition theorem is either (1) a **rational** mapping, or (2) a **periodic** mapping.*

Definition 4. If $\Phi: \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}^n$ is periodic, and if each component function φ_k of $\Phi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$ has π_k periods, then

- (a) If $\pi_k = 2n$ for all k , then Φ is a **proper abelian mapping**.
- (b) If $\pi_k < 2n$ for at least one k , then Φ is a **singular abelian mapping**.

The component φ_k is called a *proper* or *singular* abelian *function*, according as $\pi_k = 2n$ or $\pi_k < 2n$.

There is no standard terminology about the case $\pi_k < 2n$. Here is a list of terms used by various authors:

Weierstrass	Degenerate abelian function;
Painlevé	Degenerate abelian function;
Cousin	Semirational abelian function [3];
Severi	Quasi-abelian function;
Siegel	Singular abelian function.

The term “degenerate” is a good one since such functions arise when the faces of the period parallelotope of a proper abelian function are translated to infinity (this last fact is quite difficult to prove). However, the term *degenerate* is used nowadays for meromorphic functions whose period group is not a lattice, something quite different from its meaning for Weierstrass. We have chosen Siegel’s term “singular” as expressing the same property.

Note that Φ is proper if and only if all its component functions are proper. Φ is singular if and only if *two* conditions hold:

- (i) $\pi_k < 2n$ for some k ;
- (ii) Φ admits an AAT.

Our proof of Theorem 6 is based on a famous result that has fascinated mathematicians for more than a century, namely the Weierstrass–Thimm–Siegel theorem on algebraic dependence.

Theorem 11 (Weierstrass–Thimm–Siegel). *Let $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k$ be meromorphic functions on a compact complex space X . Then they are algebraically dependent if*

- (i) *they are analytically dependent; or if*
- (ii) *$k = n + 1$ and X has dimension n ; or if*

(iii) X is irreducible and $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k$ are analytically dependent on a nonempty open subset of X .

The main result is (i), while (ii) and (iii) are corollaries. Weierstrass announced (ii) for the case that $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{n+1}$ are abelian functions belonging to the period parallelootope X [20], although he never published a complete proof. The first complete proof of (i) was given by Thimm [17] in his Königsberg thesis in 1939, and then Siegel gave two proofs, in 1948 [14] and 1955 [15]. Thimm's historical review [18] is an excellent source on the origins and proofs of this theorem. Suffice it to say that nowadays the proof is so elementary that it has appeared in standard textbooks [13, 16].

This wonderful theorem makes the proof of Theorem 6 for the case of proper abelian mappings almost trivial, and has nothing with the explicit analytical form of the functions φ_k .

The case that Φ is a *singular* abelian mapping presents significant difficulties not found in the case of proper mappings. The problem is that in the latter case, the period parallelootope is a *compact* complex manifold, while there is no obvious compact counterpart for the singular mappings. Even in the case $n = 1$, the function $e^{\sin u}$ is simply periodic and indeed entire on $\mathbb{C}$, but it does not admit an AAT; its domain of definition is a noncompact period strip instead of a period parallelogram.

If $n = 1$, the singular elliptic functions turn out to be

- (i) rational functions of u ; and
- (ii) rational functions of e^{au} , for $a \in \mathbb{C}$.

If $n = 2$, the singular abelian functions turn out to be

- (i) rational functions of $\varphi_1 = u_1$ and $\varphi_2 = u_2$;
- (ii) rational functions of $\varphi_1 = u_1$ and $\varphi_2 = e^{u_2}$;
- (iii) rational functions of $\varphi_1 = e^{u_1}$ and $\varphi_2 = e^{u_2}$;
- (iv) rational functions of $\varphi_1 = \wp(u_1)$ and $\varphi_2 = u_2 - \epsilon \zeta(u_1)$;
- (v) rational functions of $\varphi_1 = \wp(u_1)$ and $\varphi_2 = e^{u_2} \sigma(u_1 - a) / \sigma(u_1)$;

where $\epsilon = 0$ or 1 , $\zeta(u_1)$ is the Weierstrass ζ -function, a is arbitrary and $\sigma(u_1)$ is the Weierstrass σ -function. That these are singular abelian functions is easy to see; Painlevé's great achievement was to prove that *there are no others*.

As an example, consider case (iv) with $\epsilon = 1$. Here

$$\varphi_1(u_1, u_2) = \wp(u_1), \quad \varphi_2(u_1, u_2) = u_2 - \zeta(u_1).$$

It is a standard result that $\zeta(u_1)$ is quasiperiodic, that is, if $2\omega_1$ and $2\omega_2$ are the periods of $\wp(u_1)$, then

$$\zeta(u_1 + 2\omega_1) = \zeta(u_1) + 2\eta_1, \quad \zeta(u_1 + 2\omega_2) = \zeta(u_1) + 2\eta_2,$$

where $\eta_1 := \zeta(\omega_1)$, $\eta_2 := \zeta(\omega_2)$. Therefore

$$\varphi_2(u_1 + 2\omega_1, u_2 + 2\eta_1) = u_2 + 2\eta_1 - \zeta(u_1 + 2\omega_1) = u_2 + 2\eta_1 - [\zeta(u_1) + 2\eta_1] = \varphi_2(u_1, u_2),$$

and similarly $\varphi_2(u_1 + 2\omega_2, u_2 + 2\eta_2) = \varphi_2(u_1, u_2)$. This means that

$$\mathbf{p}_1 := (2\omega_1, 2\eta_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{p}_2 := (2\omega_2, 2\eta_2)$$

are the two periods of the singular mapping $\Phi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2)$.

We are left with the problem of characterizing the singular abelian mappings intrinsically, so as to be able to prove Theorem 6. The cases $n = 1$ and $n = 2$ show that such functions can be regarded as *rational functions of a mobile point* $(x_1, \dots, x_p, y_1, \dots, y_q)$ on the cartesian product

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_p \times \overline{\mathbb{C}}^q,$$

where $n = p + q$, $\mathcal{A}_p$ is a Picard variety of dimension p defined by the equation

$$V(\theta; x_1, \dots, x_p) = 0,$$

and $(y_1, \dots, y_q)$ are the coordinates of a point of $\mathbb{C}^q$. We shall *define* a singular abelian function of n complex variables to be such a rational function. Note that this is the definition that Severi uses in his great memoir [12].

Proof of Theorem 6. Case 1: suppose that Φ is a *proper* abelian mapping. Then $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})$, for each $k = 1, \dots, n$, is a meromorphic function defined on the $2n$ -dimensional compact complex manifold $X \times X$ where X is the period parallelootope for Φ . By Theorem 11,

$$\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}); \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{u}), \varphi_1(\mathbf{v}), \dots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{v}), \quad (8.1)$$

being $(2n + 1)$ meromorphic functions on the $2n$ -dimensional compact complex manifold $X \times X$, are *algebraically dependent*; that is to say, the mapping Φ admits an AAT.

Case 2: Φ is a *singular* abelian mapping. Now $\varphi_k(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})$, for each $k = 1, \dots, n$, is a meromorphic function defined on the $2n$ -dimensional compact complex manifold $(\mathcal{A}_p \times \overline{\mathbb{C}}^q) \times (\mathcal{A}_p \times \overline{\mathbb{C}}^q)$, where $\mathcal{A}_p$ is a Picard variety and $p + q = n$. Thus the functions (8.1) are again algebraically dependent, by the Weierstrass–Thimm–Siegel theorem. $\square$

Acknowledgments

I are most grateful to the International Centre for Theoretical Physics at Trieste for its hospitality, stimulating atmosphere and library facilities; the idea for this paper germinated during a recent visit there. I also thank R. Balasubramanian for several conversations and insightful criticisms, and especially Joseph C. Várilly for many discussions and unrelenting encouragement. Support from the Vicerrectoría de Investigación of the University of Costa Rica is acknowledged.

References

- [1] S. A. Andrea, “Algebraic addition theorems”, *Adv. Math.* **13** (1974), 20–30.
- [2] S. Bochner and W. T. Martin, *Several Complex Variables*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1948.
- [3] P. Cousin, “Sur les fonctions triplemente periodiques de deux variables”, *Acta Math.* **33** (1910), 105–232.
- [4] H. Hancock, *Lectures on the Theory of Elliptic Functions I*, Dover, New York, 1958.
- [5] A. Hurwitz, “Beweis des Satzes, das eine einwertige Funktion bleibig vielen Variabeln, welchen überall als Quotient zweier potenzreihen dargestellt werden kann, eine rationale Funktion ihrer Argumente ist”, *J. reine angew. Math.* **95** (1883), 201–206.
- [6] S. Lang, *Algebra*, 3rd edition, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1993.
- [7] W. F. Osgood, *Lehrbuch der Funktionentheorie*, Chelsea, New York, 1965.
- [8] P. Painlevé, “Sur les fonctions qui admettent un théorème d’addition”, *Acta Math.* **27** (1903), 1–43.
- [9] R. Palais, “Some analogues of Hartog’s theorem in an algebraic setting”, *Amer. J. Math.* **100** (1978), 387–406.
- [10] E. Phragmén, “Sur un théorème concernant les fonctions elliptiques”, *Acta Math.* **7** (1883), 33–42.
- [11] E. Picard, “Memoire sur la théorie des fonctions algébriques de deux variables”, *J. Math.* **5** (1889).
- [12] F. Severi, *Funzioni Quasi Abelianne*, 2a edizione ampliata, Pont. Acad. Sci. Scripta Varia **20**, Rome, 1948.
- [13] I. R. Shafarevich, *Basic Algebraic Geometry*, 2nd edition, Springer, Berlin, 1996.
- [14] C. L. Siegel, *Analytic Functions of Several Complex Variables*, Lecture Notes, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, 1948.
- [15] C. L. Siegel, “Meromorphe Funktionen auf kompakten analytischen Mannigfaltigkeiten”, *Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen* **4** (1955), 71–77.
- [16] C. L. Siegel, *Topics in Complex Function Theory III*, Wiley, New York, 1972.
- [17] W. Thimm, “Über algebraische Relationen zwischen meromorphe Funktionen in abgeschlossenen Räumen”, thesis, Universität Königsberg, 1939.

- [18] W. Thimm, “Der Weierstraß’sche Satz der algebraischen Abhängigkeit von Abelschen Funktionen und seine Verallgemeinerungen”, in *Festschrift zur Gedächtnisteil für K. Weierstrass*, Westdeutscher Verlag, Köln, 1966; pp. 123–154.
- [19] K. Weierstrass, Lectures of 1880–81 at the University of Berlin, as cited by Painlevé [8].
- [20] K. Weierstrass, “Allgemeine Untersuchungen über die $2n$ -fach periodische Funktionen von n Veränderlichen”, in *Mathematische Werke III*, Mayer & Müller, Berlin, 1903; pp. 54–114.